



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Vat. 1899 (pp. 58–59), which has several readings of P¹ which were completely obliterated by a corrector earlier than Vat. 1899. To explain this, she thinks the scribe of Vat. 1899 had before him P (corrected by P⁶), and in addition two early copies of P. It takes also considerable faith to believe that one and the same hand wrote the various scraps reproduced on the facsimiles as Petrarch's handwriting; but one familiar with Renaissance handwriting will feel only skepticism, not disbelief. In one of the three appendices, Miss Ballou considers the dependence of B upon P, now generally admitted; B has, however, some readings which prove to be independent. Could not B and P be copies of an almost contemporary *z*, as is the case with MSS V (Fulda) and M (Hersfeld) of Ammianus? M and V reproduce lacunae as conscientiously as do B and P; but it is clear neither is a copy of the other. One feels annoyed that a great house like Teubner should not even sew the sheets of a book appealing to an English-speaking public; we are used to pamphlets whose leaves will not immediately drop out; the long-suffering Teutons still put up with it. There are also too many misprints, even considering the difficulties offered the compositors by the language.

C. U. CLARK

YALE UNIVERSITY

Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae. Iteratis curis dispositus recensuit
praefatus est HERMANNUS PETER. Vol. I. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner,
1914. Pp. x*+ccclxxx+382. M. 22.

Forty-four years after the appearance of the first edition of this (first) volume, the veteran editor had completed his revision and had seen part of the book through the press when he was called away from his long labor. It is no small merit on his part that, whatever may have been the reason, he allowed so respectable a period to elapse between editions, a striking contrast to the ordinary procedure in Germany of late. During this time an enormous amount of toil has been expended upon the microscopic examination of the sources of Roman history and their relation to the later canonical versions. Much of this labor has been fruitless, except in a negative way, and while Peter has sifted its product carefully, he has refrained from burdening the reader *coniecturis iam oblivione obrutis* (vi*), and his principal conclusions have been changed comparatively little. This in itself is a notable indication of the critical acumen and sanity of judgment of the first edition.

The revision is thorough, and at least half the book, aside from the Fragments, has been rewritten, even where argument and conclusion are practically the same in content, as in chap. iii of the Prolegomena. On the whole the style has been improved, although it is still far from being impeccable. Compare, if you will, the last sentence on p. cxvi in which seven of the first

nine words are monosyllables. The text of the *Fragmenta* themselves has been revised and the critical apparatus brought down to date. The typography of this volume corresponds with that of Vol. II (1906), but it is very unfortunate that we are still subjected to the inconvenience of having the pages of the first part numbered with Roman numerals, and of the second with Arabic.

In the case of the second edition of a work that has been recognized as a standard for forty years the function of the reviewer is to abstain from controversy on the thousand and one points that present themselves, and simply to call attention to some of the differences in substance between the two editions. In the present case these are comparatively few, as has already been remarked.

The second chapter of the *Prolegomena* of Ed. 1—*Qua ratione hae reliquiae nobis traditae sunt*—has been omitted from Ed. 2, on account of the exhaustive treatment of this subject in the author's *Wahrheit und Kunst, Geschichtsschreibung und Plagiat im klassischen Altertum*. Incidentally we note the passing of *reliquiae* without a pang. While the editor holds the same view of the origin of the *Annales Maximi*, he now supposes that the tablets were placed on the Regia just before the Samnite wars instead of a little before the Gallic invasion (cf. Cichorius, *ca.* 400 b.c.). Chap. ii, *De litterarum monumentis privatis*, has been considerably amplified; more emphasis is laid on the importance of the material supplied for *laudationes* by family records; the list of *laudationes* known to have been published has been revised by dropping that delivered in 68 b.c. by Caesar for his wife Cornelia, and by adding that spoken by Augustus over Marcellus; and the evidence for the use of *commentarii familiae* by Livy is more fully illustrated in the case of the Fabii, Cornelii, and Claudii. It is clear that Peter had come to regard this kind of influence in the development of historical writing as far greater than before (cf. lvii: "Fabius Pictor . . . laudes sua gentis etiam ita illustravit ut alias obscuraret atque in his fundamentis historiam Romanam posuit").

In a long discussion of the well-known passage in Dionysius (i. 6) where that historian characterizes the method of Fabius and Cincius, Peter rejects his former interpretation of κεφαλαιώδως by *summatim vel breviter* (I, lxxiii), and explains the term by *capitulatim* (II, lxxiii); and in the comparison of Fabius and Diocles Peparethius by Plutarch (*vit. Rom.* 3), which has always been a source of mystification, he clears up the meaning by adopting an explanation published some years before (*BphW*, 1906, 241). Both of these views are to be commended, but it is doubtful whether the same can be said of his stout defense (pp. lxxv-lxxvi) of his former explanation of the reason why the earlier annalists wrote in Greek, against that of most modern scholars (*RE*, VI, 1838).

The date of the grammarian, L. Cincius Alimentus, is now placed (p. cvii) between Varro and Verrius Flaccus instead of soon after 120 b.c.

(I), and fragments 1, 2, are assigned to him, no longer to the annalist (cf. Cichorius, *RE*, III, 2557). Among the *Fragmenta* Peter now quotes the substance of the letter of Scipio Africanus to Philip (*Polyb.* x. 6–9) and that of Scipio Nasica (*Plut. Aem.* 15–16, 21), but not the substance of the letters of these two Scipios to Prusias (*Polyb.* xxi. 9; *Liv.* xxxvii. 25). This seems strange in view of what he has to say on this subject (p. cxvii). In I he had denied that the Claudius who translated the annals of Acilius into Latin was Claudius Quadrigarius. Afterward (*JJ*, CXXV, 153–55) he changed his mind, and now (pp. cxxii, 292) he argues strongly for this identification, although there is still a plentiful lack of agreement among critics.

The detailed criticism of the reasons assigned by Niebuhr, Bormann and others for the title of Cato's *Origines* (I, cxxxii–cxxvii) is omitted from II. In opposition to a prevalent view (e.g., Leo, *Kultur d. Gegenwart*³, p. 419) Peter insists that Cato did treat in outline of the history of Rome from the expulsion of the kings to the Punic wars and that *origines*, meaning both origin and history, was the title of the first three books, to which the others, published afterward, were incorrectly attached. In I he was still in doubt as to the reason why Cato did not mention the names of the Roman commanders, but in II (p. cxli) he accepts the view of Nipperdey that the names of the consuls and praetors were prefixed to the annals of each year, and therefore were not repeated in the text. It seems difficult to reconcile this with a later statement (p. cxlvii) that Cato's work did not serve the purpose of later annalists well, “neque enim nominati erant bellorum duces qui multo cum labore ex aliis annalibus conquirendi erant.” In the first edition small allowance was made for the influence of Greek literature on Cato's work, but quite the contrary view is held in the second. The opinion expressed in I (p. clvii) that Pliny drew directly from Cato is now modified (p. cliv) by the admission that he also drew indirectly through Nepos. Similarly, in regard to a direct connection between Pliny and Cassius Hemina he has changed his mind (p. clxviii) and thinks that all later writers except Appian got their knowledge of Hemina through Varro or someone else.

Accepting the view that Piso agreed with Cato in assuming that Rome was founded in Olympiad vii. 1, Peter rather oddly makes no mention of the apparent testimony of Censorinus (*De die nat.* 17. 13) that Piso put this event in 758, nor of the modern support that this has received (cf. Cichorius, *RE*, III, 1394). The hypothesis of a second C. Fannius, based on Polybius (pp. xxviii, 4) and stoutly maintained in some quarters (*RE*, VI, 1988), is rightly rejected (p. cxciv), and considerable evidence is marshalled to show that Fannius did not simply invent the speeches inserted in his history. The theory of two Gellii, supported in I, has been abandoned (p. cciv) and all fragments are now assigned to Cn. Gellius, *vir monetalis* between 154 and 134 B.C., who is therefore placed before Coelius Antipater instead of after him (I). Fragment 34, in which *agellius* (*codd.*) had been read “A. Gellius,” is now bracketed and assigned to Asellio (2A), and the unqualified statement

of I that there were 97 books of Gellius' *Annales* is made only as a possibility.

Since Marx has proved that Coelius Antipater dedicated his work to L. Aelius not to Laelius, Peter thinks (p. ccxvi) that the title may have been "L. Coelii Antipatri bellum Punici alterius libri septem ad L. Aelium," and as the same scholar has restored *Coelius* for the vulgate *Lucilius* in *Auct. ad Her.* iv. 12. 18, this passage is now admitted among the fragments of Coelius (24B). Three other fragments are added, one (24A) with good reason, the other two (66, 67) on very uncertain grounds. A change of view is also seen in the stemma of relationship between annalists and historians (p. cccxxi), in which Coelius has become a direct source of Valerius Antias.

The improvement in form is perhaps more striking in the revised chapters on M. Aemilius Scaurus and P. Rutilius Rufus than anywhere else. Peter follows Pais in placing Rutilius' birth before 156 B.C. (p. eclvi), instead of in 151-52 (I), but does not follow him in attributing to this annalist sundry passages in Appian, Diodorus, and others where Pais goes too far. In I a *liber de antiquitatibus* was attributed to Catulus, and fragments 9-13 assigned to it; in II the existence of any such book is denied, and these fragments (except 10) are assigned to the *historia communis*. An earlier view of the editor (cf. *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*) that this *historia communis* was the work of Daphnis, the freedman of Catulus, is now rejected, as well as that of Buettner who regards it as the joint product of Catulus and Daphnis.

A noteworthy addition to the chapter on Claudius Quadrigarius is the argument (pp. cclxxxvii-cclxxxix) to prove that Claudius began his annals with the Gallic invasion in order to rehabilitate the Claudi and to plead their cause against the Fabii, in the same way that Valerius Antias (p. ccxiv) began his at an earlier date in order to extol the Valerii at the expense of the Claudi. The chapter on Valerius is much longer than in I, and contains an able and convincing discussion of his use of rhetorical art for the purpose of confounding Claudius Quadrigarius and the Claudi in general.

On p. cccxxvi Niese is incorrectly quoted among those who believe that Sisenna was born in 151 B.C. (cf. *RE*, IV, 1512); in I Peter had admitted the reading in Nonius (127 = frag. 3): *Sisenna ab urbe condita*, and had explained it as a possible title for the first book of the *historiae*, in II (p. cccxxxix) he rejects both reading and explanation; the existence of orations of Sisenna in published form, maintained in I on the supposed evidence of Tacitus (*Dial.* 23), is now absolutely denied (p. ccxlvi); and the *commentarii Plautini*, which were assigned to the historian in I, are now correctly attributed to a post-Vergilian grammarian, with a corresponding rearrangement of the fragments.

Fragment 23, assigned unhesitatingly to Licinus Macer in I, is now referred to C. Clodius Licinus (cf. II, 78), and with it goes the only evidence for more than sixteen books in Licinius' history (p. cccli). It is interesting

to note that Peter now believes that it was Q. Aelius Tubero the historian to whom Dionysius dedicated his *Thucydides* (p. ccclxx), and comforting to catch so accurate a scholar writing S. Iulio (p. ccclxxviii)!

The index shows that twenty-nine fragments have been dropped from the list of I, and fourteen added. Besides the misprints mentioned in the Errata, about twenty more have been noted, but they are mostly unimportant.

S. B. P.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

Livy, Book XXI and Selections from Books XXII-XXX. By JAMES C. EGBERT. New York: Macmillan, 1913. 12mo. pp. xvii+306. \$0.60.

This is one of the volumes in Macmillan's "Latin Classics Series" whose motto is, "*The notes are written to instruct and not to impress.*" The italics are not mine. The implied converse would furnish an interesting subject for debate, but it would be unfair, obviously, to criticize this volume or series for not being what it does not pretend to be.

The selections include the battle at the Trasimene Lake and the battle of Cannae from book xxii; the siege of Capua from book xxvi; the battle at the Metaurus from book xxvii, and the battle of Zama from book xxx. The student who has covered the text of this volume has thus followed the fortunes of Hannibal from the beginning of the war through its most vital crises to the final defeat. He misses much, inevitably—the siege of Syracuse, the death of Marcellus, and, most of all, the wonderful ringing note of triumph in defeat with which the twenty-second book closes.

The Introduction is a model of clearness and brevity. It would be more exact, perhaps, to speak of Silenus (p. xii) as Hannibal's historiographer than merely as "a Greek historian with a pro-Carthaginian spirit." It would have been well—considering the audience whom it was designed to instruct but not to impress—if the statement (p. xiii) that, in his first decade, Livy is a writer of the Silver Age were further explained. The maps and plans (except that of the Trasimene Lake) are placed with the notes. It would be easier to refer to particular words in the text if the lines on the page as well as the sections of the chapters had been numbered. This has been done in some of the later volumes of the series.

The notes are concise and give just the information needed by the young student to master the text. The maps and plans are clear except the one following p. 198, which deals with Hannibal's route over the Alps. Why are two routes marked "according to Livy"? There is already enough confusion in that matter. I have often wondered why so little weight has been given to